

REMARKS

This paper is filed in response to the Office Actions mailed August 23, 2007.

Following the amendments above, claims 1-25 are now pending. Claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,084,587 to Tarr et al (“Tarr”). Claims 16-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. 6,563,487 to Martin et al (“Martin”). Claims 12-15 were objected to for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

Applicant has added claims 23-25, and amended claims 1-4 and 11-22. No new matter is added by these amendments, and support may be found in the specification and claims as originally filed.

Reconsideration and allowance of all claims is respectfully requested in light of the amendments above and the remarks below.

I. Objection – Claims 12-15

Applicant has amended claims 12-15 to depend from claim 16, which recites a switch. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the objection of claims 12-15.

II. § 102(b) – Tarr – Claims 1-11

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner’s rejection of claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Tarr.

To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), a reference must disclose each and every element of the claimed invention. *See* M.P.E.P. § 2131.

Because Tarr does not disclose “defining a user interface having a plurality of input elements arranged in a matrix configuration; defining a first cell, the first cell comprising a first parameter representing a first haptic effect; [and] assigning the first cell to a first input element in the matrix configuration” as recited in amended claim 1, Tarr does not anticipate claim 1. Tarr generally discloses a virtual entity within a virtual world having physical characteristics. However, Tarr does not disclose “defining a user

interface having a plurality of input elements arranged in a matrix configuration,” as recited in amended claim 1. Further, Tarr does not disclose “defining a first cell, the first cell comprising a first parameter representing a first haptic effect; assigning the first cell to a first input element in the matrix configuration,” also as recited in claim 1. Thus, Tarr does not anticipate claim 1.

Because claims 2-11 depend from and further limit claim 1, Tarr does not anticipate claims 2-11 for at least the same reasons. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 2-11.

III. § 102(b) – Tarr – Claims 12-22

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner’s rejection of claims 12-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Tarr.

To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), a reference must disclose each and every element of the claimed invention. *See* M.P.E.P. § 2131.

Because Tarr does not disclose “a processor ... configured to ... cause the actuator to generate a haptic effect based at least in part on the sensor signal, wherein the haptic effect comprises a plurality of detents defining a first primary channel defined along a first axis, a second primary channel defined along a second axis, a first secondary channel proximate to the first primary channel, and a second secondary channel proximate to the second primary channel, the detents configured to substantially constrain movement to one of the first primary channel, the second primary channel, the first secondary channel, or the second secondary channel,” as recited in claim 16, Tarr does not anticipate claim 1. Tarr does not disclose a switch comprising a processor configured to define a plurality of channels separated by detents. As such, Tarr does not anticipate amended claim 16. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 16.

Because claims 12-15 and 17-22 depend from and further limit claim 16, Tarr does not anticipate these claims. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 12-15 and 17-22.

IV. § 102(e) – Martin – Claims 16-22

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection of claims 16-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Tarr.

To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), a reference must disclose each and every element of the claimed invention. *See* M.P.E.P. § 2131.

Because Martin does not disclose “a processor ... configured to ... cause the actuator to generate a haptic effect based at least in part on the sensor signal, wherein the haptic effect comprises a plurality of detents defining a first primary channel defined along a first axis, a second primary channel defined along a second axis, a first secondary channel proximate to the first primary channel, and a second secondary channel proximate to the second primary channel, the detents configured to substantially constrain movement to one of the first primary channel, the second primary channel, the first secondary channel, or the second secondary channel,” as recited in amended claim 16. Martin discloses a game controller having a directional pad and a joystick movable in separate axes. However, Martin does not disclose “a processor ... configured to ... cause the actuator to generate a haptic effect based at least in part on the sensor signal, wherein the haptic effect comprises a plurality of detents defining a first primary channel defined along a first axis, a second primary channel defined along a second axis, a first secondary channel proximate to the first primary channel, and a second secondary channel proximate to the second primary channel, the detents configured to substantially constrain movement to one of the first primary channel, the second primary channel, the first secondary channel, or the second secondary channel.” Thus, Martin does not anticipate claim 16. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 16.

Because claims 17-22 depend from and further limit claim 16, Martin does not anticipate claims 17-22. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 17-22.

V. Prior Art Made of Record and Not Relied Upon

In the Conclusion, the Office Action lists references which were made of record and not relied upon. Applicant respectfully traverses the characterization and relevance of these references as prior art or otherwise, and respectfully reserves the right to present such arguments and other material should the Examiner maintain rejection of Applicant's claims, based upon the references made of record and not relied upon or otherwise.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully asserts that in view of the amendments and remarks above, all pending claims are allowable and Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of all claims.

Should the Examiner have any comments, questions, or suggestions of a nature necessary to expedite the prosecution of the application, or to place the case in condition for allowance, the Examiner is courteously requested to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Date:

12/20/2007

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
1001 West Fourth Street
Winston-Salem, NC 27101
(336) 607-7474 (voice)
(336) 734-2629 (fax)

Respectfully submitted,



Carl Sanders
Reg. No. 57,203